

1 The Honorable Robert S. Lasnik
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT SEATTLE

11 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF
12 WASHINGTON, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
16 HOMELAND SECURITY, et al.,

17 Defendants.

18 No. C17-00562-RSL

19 JOINT STATUS REPORT AND
20 DISCOVERY PLAN

21 Pursuant to the Court's Order Regarding Joint Status Report ("Order," Dkt. No. 9), the
22 parties to this action jointly submit this Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan.

23 For reasons discussed below, the parties jointly request that the Court set August 25,
24 2017, as the date for the parties to submit another Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan.

25 **1. Nature and complexity of the case:** This is an action under the Freedom of
26 Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 552. It is based on the FOIA request submitted by
27 Plaintiffs on February 2, 2017 and attached as Exhibit A to the Complaint (Dkt. No. 1).

28 **2. Proposed deadline for joining additional parties:** September 15, 2017.

29 **3. Consent to Assignment to Magistrate:** No.

30 **4. Related cases:** The Order notes the Court is aware of the 12 other matters
31 Defendants have sought to transfer, along with this case, to the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict
32

1 Litigation. Plaintiffs do not believe these are “related cases,” for reasons noted in prior filings
 2 (see Dkt. Nos. 3, 15), and are not aware of any other case in this or any other jurisdiction that
 3 could be considered “related” to this FOIA action. Plaintiffs do not believe the cases noted by
 4 Defendants below are “related cases,” under LCR 3(g) or otherwise. Nor do Plaintiffs believe
 5 the number of FOIA requests about the subject Executive Order (“Protecting the Nation From
 6 Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States”) relevant to this case, except as an indication of
 7 the profound public interest in the Defendants’ interpretation and implementation of that order..

8 Defendants note that, in addition to the ACLU cases of which this Court is already
 9 aware, there are several other FOIA suits that have been filed against the U.S. Department of
 10 Homeland Security and/or U.S. Customs and Border Protection concerning FOIA requests
 11 seeking records related to Executive Order 13769. These cases include: *James Madison*
 12 *Project, et al. v. DHS*, No. 17-cv-388 (D.D.C.); *James Madison Project, et al. v. DOJ, et al.*,
 13 No. 17-cv-390 (D.D.C.); *James Madison Project, et al. v. DHS*, No. 17-cv-1281 (D.D.C.);
 14 *American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee v. CBP*, No. 17-cv-708 (D.D.C.); *Muslim*
 15 *Advocates v. DHS*, No. 17-cv-813 (D.D.C.); *Muslim Advocates v. DHS*, No. 17-cv-820
 16 (D.D.C.); *Currier v. DHS, et al.*, No. 17-cv-1799 (N.D. Cal.); and *Council on American-Islamic*
 17 *Relations-Connecticut, et al. v. USCIS, et al.*, No. 17-cv-1061 (D. Conn.). Defendants have
 18 received over 100 FOIA requests which relate to the same general subject matter, so additional
 19 lawsuits may be filed. Defendants do not necessarily assert that these cases are all “related”
 20 within the meaning of Local Civil Rule 3(g), but bring these additional cases and FOIA
 21 requests to the Court’s attention given the similarity in the subject of the requests and/or the
 22 records requested, and the demands that they place on Defendants’ limited resources.

23 **5. Discovery plan:**

24 **Preliminary statement:** To date, no discovery has taken place, and the parties agree
 25 that it would be premature to set a discovery schedule at this time.

26 Plaintiffs state that discovery is often unnecessary in FOIA cases, and may be
 27 unnecessary here. Plaintiffs also state, however, that it is premature to foreclose discovery.

1 Contrary to Defendants' statement below, courts have found discovery appropriate in FOIA
 2 cases, including on the issue of the adequacy of an agency's search. *See, e.g., Weisberg v.*
 3 *United States Dept. Of Justice*, 627 F.2d 365, 371 (D.C. Cir. 1980). Plaintiffs also disagree
 4 with Defendants' suggestion below that they would be entitled to discovery into
 5 communications among various ACLU entities, and reserve the right to object to such
 6 discovery.

7 Defendants state that discovery is generally unavailable to plaintiffs in FOIA actions.
 8 The adequacy of an agency's search for records responsive to a FOIA request and the
 9 appropriateness of an agency's decision to withhold information are ordinarily determined on
 10 the basis of declarations supplied by the agency, which the court may direct the agency to
 11 supplement with additional information if the court finds that the agency's initial submissions
 12 do not establish the agency's compliance with the FOIA.

13 Defendants additionally state that, if the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation denies
 14 Defendants' motion to consolidate this action with the parallel FOIA actions filed by other
 15 ACLU affiliates in twelve other courts, Defendants may seek discovery regarding Plaintiffs'
 16 coordination with the national ACLU and other ACLU affiliates in filing their respective FOIA
 17 requests and lawsuits. Defendants may seek such discovery in order to establish grounds for
 18 nonparty preclusion in the event that Plaintiffs seek to re-litigate in this action issues that have
 19 been decided against one or more other ACLU affiliates.

20 Defendants made an initial release of records on July 14, 2017. Defendants have
 21 advised Plaintiffs that CBP's search for, and processing of, records responsive to Plaintiffs'
 22 FOIA request is ongoing, but more time is needed to assess the volume of potentially
 23 responsive material requiring further review. Defendants also anticipate requesting that
 24 Plaintiffs clarify the scope of Part 1 of their FOIA request.

25 Defendants have proposed that the parties confer and submit another Joint Status Report
 26 in one month, when the agencies expect to have further information. Plaintiffs agree to this
 27 proposal, on the understanding that the agencies will be prepared, at the time of the next Joint

1 Status Report, to provide additional information about CBP's anticipated timing for completing
 2 its search and for producing records. Plaintiffs reserve the right, at that time, to ask the Court
 3 to set a schedule for the agencies to complete their search and produce records and a *Vaughn*
 4 index. Accordingly, the parties jointly request that the Court set August 25, 2017 as the date
 5 for the parties to submit another Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan. The parties will
 6 confer cooperatively ahead of that submission.

7 **A. Discovery regarding agency's search/sufficiency of production:**

8 Plaintiffs are unable to state at this time whether discovery into these areas will be necessary,
 9 for reasons stated above. They anticipate responding more completely in the next Joint Status
 10 Report noted above. Defendants respectfully refer the Court to the above Preliminary
 11 Statement.

12 **B. Discovery management:** The parties respectfully refer the Court to the
 13 above Preliminary Statement.

14 **C. Deadline for administrative record and/or the *Vaughn* indices:** See
 15 Preliminary Statement above regarding the filing of a Joint Status Report on August 25, 2017.

16 **6. Discovery deadline:** See point 5, Preliminary Statement.

17 **7. Prompt and efficient resolution:** The parties anticipate this case will be fully
 18 resolved on a motion or cross-motions for summary judgment.

19 **8. Dispositive motion briefing schedule:** See Section 5, above. The parties agree
 20 further information is required regarding Defendants' search for and production of records
 21 before a briefing schedule can be set.

22 **9. Trial:** The parties anticipate this case will be fully resolved on summary
 23 judgment. They do not request a trial date.

24 **10. Jury:** No party has requested a jury.

25 **11. Trial days:** The parties anticipate this case will be fully resolved on summary
 26 judgment. They do not request a trial date.

27

12. Corporate disclosures: Plaintiffs (the only non-governmental entities in this matter) made the required FRCP 7.1 and LCR 7.1 disclosures on April 18, 2017 (Dkt. No. 4).

13. Service: All Defendants have been served.

14. Consent to Pilot Project on Cameras in the Courtroom: No.

DATED this 21st day of July, 2017.

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

By s/Eric M. Stahl

Eric M. Stahl, WSBA #27619
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101-3045
Telephone: 206-757-8148
Fax: 206-757-7148
E-mail: ericstahl@dwt.com

Emily Chiang, WSBA #50517
American Civil Liberties Union of
Washington Foundation
901 Fourth Avenue, #630
Seattle, WA 98164
Email: echiang@aclu-wa.org

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs
American Civil Liberties Union of
Washington, American Civil Liberties
Union of Montana, and American Civil
Liberties Union of North Dakota*

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General

ANNETTE L. HAYES
United States Attorney

ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO
Deputy Director, Federal Programs Branch

/s/Matthew J. Berns
MATTHEW J. BERNS
Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20530
Tel.: (202) 616-8016/Fax: (202) 616-8470
Email: matthew.j.berns@usdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
and U.S. Customs and Border Protection*

1 CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that on July 20, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing document with
3 the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to
4 the attorneys of record registered on the CM/ECF system. All other parties (if any) shall be
5 served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

6 DATED this 20th day of July, 2017.

7
8 /s/Eric M. Stahl
9 Eric M. Stahl, WSBA #27619

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27